



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to examine (or compare) various editions of the Aeneid one with the other. But it is better for the teacher at all times to preserve independent right of judgment (it is assumed, of course, that the judgment is to rest on study and knowledge of Latin and of Vergil both). As every one knows, certain views tend to become traditional, and are passed down from edition to edition, but it does not follow at all that the traditional view is correct. For example, in Aeneid 1.58-59, said of Aeolus controlling the winds,

*ni faciat, maria ac terras caelumque profundum
quippe ferant secum rapidi verrantque per auras,*

most editions interpret *ni faciat*, etc., as a condition contrary to fact. To be sure the tempting translation in English is, 'did he not do that', etc., which is a contrary to fact conditional form. Yet, here as elsewhere, we may well pray not to be led into temptation. Surely, no teacher needs to be told that it is an entirely erroneous process to work back from the translation to an interpretation of the original. As Professor Morris H. Morgan¹⁷ noted long ago, and I myself noted independently of Professor Morgan in my note on this line, it is entirely possible to interpret the present subjunctive here exactly as we regularly interpret the present subjunctive in a conditional sentence, i. e. as 'future more vivid' rather than as contrary to fact: the line means 'should he fail to do this, the winds would', etc.

Take another example. In Aeneid 1.76-80 Aeolus speaks thus:

Aeolus haec contra: "Tuus, o regina, quid optes,
explorare labor; mihi iussa capessere fas est.
Tu mihi quodcumque hoc regni, tu sceptrum Iovemque
concilias, tu das epulis accumbere divum
nimborumque facis tempestatumque potentem".

Most editors, and the authors of at least one good Latin Grammar interpret *quodcumque hoc regni* as meaning 'the little sovereignty I possess', but even a moment's reflection should have shown them that this interpretation does not fit the passage at all. It would certainly be undiplomatic in the highest degree for Aeolus or any one else to say to his benefactor, 'It is your task to determine what you wish, mine to carry out your wish, for I owe to you the little measure of sovereignty I possess'. The words mean, rather, 'every atom of sovereignty I possess', and carry rather the implication that the debt is far from small; the passage is intensive, not diminutive in effect.

Thus far I have been emphasizing the importance, in the main, of studying Vergil himself. After one has studied Vergil in some such way as this—but not till then—he should pass on to study Vergil's influence on later ages, and, finally, what has been written about Vergil by authors and critics of ancient and modern times both.

¹⁷Addresses and Essays, 38-40 (American Book Company, 1910). On pages 40-41 Professor Morgan discussed equally well Aeneid 6.292-294, *ni . . . admonet . . . irruat, et . . . diverberet umbras*.

The Aeneid won instantaneous recognition. All Latin literature subsequent to Vergil, both in prose and in verse, shows the influence of deep study and profound knowledge of Vergil. In the writings of Seneca, the philosopher (3 B. C. to 65 A. D.), there are dozens of references to Vergil. Livy, Ovid, Juvenal, Tacitus, all alike show the influence of the study of Vergil. Lines of Vergil have been found scratched on walls in Pompeii and in Rome. Three inscriptions on the walls in Pompeii give parts of the (traditional) first verse of the Aeneid; on yet another wall we find part of the first verse of Aeneid 2. In 1891 there were discovered at Pompeii two medallion portraits, one of Vergil, one of Horace. Before Vergil lies a copy of Homer, before Horace a volume bearing the name of Sappho; clearly, from the very outset, Horace and Vergil were associated in the minds of the Romans as the great lyric and the great epic poet of Rome. In far off Tunis a mosaic has been found which represents Vergil as composing the Aeneid. Finally, leaving Latin literature, the student may trace the influence of Vergil in later times and the judgments passed on him in those later days, by studying the works of Comparetti, Tüchsen, Glover (already referred to: page 3), and the chapters on Vergil in such excellent books as J. W. Duff, A Literary History of Rome (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909); J. W. Mackail, Latin Literature (Scribner's, 1895); M. S. Dimsdale, A History of Latin Literature (D. Appleton and Co., 1915).

Now, I hope no one will raise the cry, How am I to find time to do all this? I have been writing to those who have been teaching Vergil and mean to teach Vergil for a long time—not to persons to whom teaching is a stopgap between High School or College and matrimony in the one case, or money-making business in the other. The whole programme I have suggested no one can work out in a single year. But any one with brains and energy can work out a part of it each year. And one who does that will never complain that 'it is a bore to teach the same thing year by year'. A teacher who is really growing will find something new in Vergil (or Caesar, or Cicero) every year, some new point of view from which to study and to teach his works. Thus, the handling of Vergil will have about it an element of unfailing novelty. Let every teacher of Vergil ask himself, How much of this programme dare I leave out and yet call myself a teacher of Vergil?

C. K.

REVIEW

The Fragments of Empedocles, Translated into English Verse. By William Ellery Leonard, Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company (1908). Pp. viii + 92. \$1.00.

The volume opens with a metrical translation of Lucretius, De Rerum Natura 1.716 ff. Twelve pages are then taken up with Empedocles: the man, the

philosopher, the poet. In this study the author treats Empedocles's life, personality, and works, the history of the text, translations, ideas and poetry.

One paragraph in this part of the work deserves special mention (10):

He was a true poet. There is first the grandeur of his conception. Its untruth of the intellect of to-day should not blind us to its truth and power for the imagination, the same yesterday, to-day, and perhaps forever. Indeed, Milton, Dante, Hegel, Goethe argue greater things for the mind than any truth, however ingeniously discovered in the petty world of facts.

In the statement that an idea may be imposing even for the intellect where the intellect repudiates the validity of that idea, the author is reminding us that, if man were only what we call intellect, ideas such as we know them to be would never be formed at all. It is an undetermined factor as yet, but instinct must be reckoned with as a necessary factor in the formation of ideas, as some of the modern apostles of science are attempting to show.

Following a brief Bibliography are the fragments On Nature, then those On Purifications, and at the end are the Notes. The fragments number 153 and are arranged according to the order of Diels's *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. In each instance the fragment is given in full and is followed immediately by the metrical translation. The task of rendering in metrical English any of the ancient poets is difficult. Empedocles is particularly difficult because of the often obscure nature of the subject-matter, and because of the very fragmentary character of his works as they have come down to us. An instance of these difficulties may be seen in the condensed and obscure style of Fragment 15, which is rendered thus:

No wise man dreams such folly in his heart,
That only whilst we live what men call life
We have our being and take our good and ill,
And ere as mortals we compacted be,
And when as mortals we be loosed apart,
We are as nothing.

In the notes on this fragment the author quotes Zeller in substantiation of the claim that there is here no affirmation of the immortality of the psychic life. It would seem quite consistent, however, to consider this fragment such an affirmation, especially since elsewhere Empedocles plainly teaches that the soul of man is immortal and survives the death of the body (compare Frag. 115), and that even the philosopher himself claimed to have enjoyed a prior existence in various forms of life upon the earth (Fragg. 117-121).

Another instance of these difficulties is found in Fragment 4, in which the philosopher urges that in the process of perception one sense must not be trusted more than another, but that all the members in which there is a 'way of knowledge' must be trusted. And it is true, as the author points out in the notes on this fragment, that Aristotle, *De Anima* 3.3.427A, says *καίτοι γε ἀρχαῖοι τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ τὸ αἰσθάνεσθαι ταὐτὸν εἶναι φασιν, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς εἰρηκε "πρὸς παρεδὸν γὰρ μῆτις*

δέξεται ἀνθρώποις", but the very fragment itself calls for a judgment by the mind between the senses and therefore assumes a criterion of truth above the senses, and Aristotle's comment is not out of keeping with this when taken in connection with his main contention that 'thought and intelligence are commonly regarded as a kind of perception, since the soul in both of these judges and recognizes something existent'. Aristotle here does not seem to confine *αἰσθάνεσθαι* entirely to the world of sense. Furthermore, statements in Fragments 2, 3, and 105 go to show that there are certain functions of the mind which belong to it quite independently of sense. This interpretation, too, was held by the later writers (compare Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* 7.122).

The longest and probably the most difficult passage in Empedocles is Fragment 17. Here the cosmic process is said to be a double process, the formation of unity from diversity, and the breaking up of this unity into diversity. Love and Hate are said to be the moving causes in this process. This is the ever-alternating process of becoming and ceasing to be. Each new thing is the result of a union of elements derived from the breaking down of some previous combination of elements. There are thus four periods in the revolution of being: two extremes, 'the sphere' and complete dissolution, and two means, the intermediate periods in this cycle. As others have pointed out, this present world of ours can have place in such a cosmic scheme only in the second or in the fourth period, that is, this present orderly array could come into and have being either in the period of successive separation or in that of successive recombination, but not in either of the other periods. The two possible periods in which our world could exist are the periods in which, in the one case, hate predominates in the cosmic order but love is not entirely excluded, and, in the other, love predominates but hate is not wholly eliminated. This developing of a unity out of the original cosmic chaos is at one with the doctrine of the early Pythagoreans. But the remainder of their cosmic process was simpler than that of Empedocles, since with the Pythagoreans the process of unit-forming, after the first unity was formed, proceeded continuously until the present orderly universe was set in array.

In our judgment, one of the best pieces of work in the book is that on Fragment 84, in which the philosopher sets forth his fanciful idea about the function of the eye in the sense of sight, and which the author translates as follows:

As when a man, about to sally forth,
Prepares a light and kindles him a blaze
Of flaming fire against the wintry night,
In horny lantern shielding from all winds;
Though it protect from breath of blowing winds,
Its beam darts outward, as more fine and thin,
And with untiring rays lights up the sky:
Just so the Fire primeval once lay hid
In the round pupil of the eye, enclosed

And thus kept off the watery deeps around,
Whilst Fire burst outward, as more fine and thin.

The author has undertaken a heavy task. He has entered, however, into the real spirit of the early sage, and has given us a strong and vigorous rendering of the philosopher's thought. Usually, too, the original idea is adequately, though sometimes elaborately, expressed. Emphasis and attractiveness are often added by the versification. The result, no doubt, has justified the effort of the author to gain for Empedocles a better appreciation among students of thought and lovers of poetry.

WASHINGTON AND
JEFFERSON COLLEGE.

ROBERT B. ENGLISH.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH AND VICINITY¹

Ten years ago, when I was teaching Latin and Greek in the Carnegie High School, I came in touch with the inspiring influence of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States and The Classical Association of the Middle West and South. I had visions of a similar organization in Pittsburgh which would include all who were fond of the Classics in Western Pennsylvania, the extreme Eastern part of Ohio, and Northern West Virginia. I thought such an organization would help to unify the interests of classical teachers, and develop a larger appreciation of classical literature, and that it would at the same time be a distributing center for a more general knowledge of the happenings in the world which are of significance to classical students.

After pondering these things, I wrote to Professor H. S. Scribner, of the Greek Department of the Western University of Pennsylvania (now the University of Pittsburgh), concerning the formation of such a Classical Association. He undertook to interest the College faculties of the community and I sought to reach the teachers in the Secondary Schools.

We had sufficiently encouraging response to justify our calling a meeting.

The following persons met in the Pittsburgh Academy, on May 25, 1907: Mr. Charles Coffin, Allegheny High School; Miss Sara Covert, Homestead High School; Mr. Dougherty, Avalon High School; Miss Ethel Fitzsimmons, Coraopolis High School; Mr. Griffiths, Avalon High School; Miss Loretta Mitchell, Fifth Street School; Miss Elizabeth Minor, Central High School; N. Anna Petty, Carnegie High School; Miss Martha Sanford, Sheridan High School; Professor H. S. Scribner, Western University of Pennsylvania; Miss Effie Sloan, Bellevue High School; Mr. W. L. Smith, Allegheny High School; Mr. Spiker, Munhall High School; Mrs. Lyda Williams, Homestead High School. Professor Scribner was elected temporary President and the writer Secretary pro tempore. Many enthusiastic speeches were made favoring a permanent organization.

Our next meeting was held on November 9, 1907. Thirteen persons were present, six of whom were not at the first meeting: Messrs. A. A. Hays and R. B. English of Washington and Jefferson College, Miss D. E. Lovejoy, of the Pennsylvania College for Women, Mr. McCullough, of Allegheny High School, Mr. J. B. Hench, of Shadyside Academy, and Miss Ruth R.

¹This account is condensed from a letter sent by Miss Petty, then President of the Association, to the joint meeting of The Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity and The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the University of Pittsburgh, April 27-28, 1917. Miss Petty was absent on leave, and a student then, at Columbia University. It is a pleasure to be able to publish so good a record as this letter contains. c. k.

Ealy, of Homestead. At this meeting A. A. Hays, W. L. Smith and N. Anna Petty were appointed to draft a constitution. It was unanimously agreed that Saturday morning was the best time for our meetings. The first officers of the Association were as follows: Professor H. S. Scribner, First Vice-President; A. A. Hays, Second Vice-President; N. Anna Petty, Secretary-Treasurer.

The first lecture before the Association was given that same month, on November 23, by Dr. R. B. English, of Washington and Jefferson College, on The Roman Forum in 1906. At that meeting the constitution was adopted. The object of The Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity was set forth as follows: "To create a larger appreciation of classical literature, to encourage more efficient instruction, and to unify the interests of classical teachers".

On January 11, 1908, Dr. Elliott, of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., gave an illustrated lecture on A Day at Old Troy with Dörpfeld's Party.

In February, 1908, an invitation was extended to Dr. Charles Knapp, of Columbia University, to address the Association in the following April. Dr. Knapp is the godfather of the Association. From its very inception he has cheered us on, freely given suggestions, and published reports in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY of all our meetings. He gave an illustrated lecture on The Roman Theater, in April, 1908. Again, when the Association met at Washington and Jefferson College in February, 1910, Dr. Knapp spoke on Some Phases of Roman Business Life as Seen in Horace. In April, 1914, he gave us a paper entitled References to Literature in Plautus and Terence.

The following list of papers read at our meetings shows the place of Greek in the programmes of The Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity:

An address by Dr. Riddle, in May, 1908, Dost thou know Greek?; Professor Scribner's paper, Position of Women in Ancient Greece and Rome; Dr. Kelso's lecture, in February, 1909, The Attic Theater of the Fifth Century (a discussion of the Agamemnon of Aeschylus); a paper by Professor Hamilton Ford Allen, of Washington and Jefferson College, in December, 1909, on Positions taken by the Ships in the Battle of Salamis; in 1910, a paper by Dr. Hussey on Plato's Ideals as given in the Republic, and Dr. Kelso's address on Hellenistic Greek; in 1911 Professor Edward B. Capps, of Princeton University, lectured on Some Aspects of Greek Comedy; in 1912 Professor Allen presented an account of Recent Notable Finds in Greek Manuscripts. In 1913, Professor Scribner read a paper on The Influence of Homer on Education, and Principal Maurice Hutton, of University College, Toronto, Canada, spoke on The Wit and Wisdom of Herodotus. In 1914 Professor Scribner spoke on The Art of Euripides. In 1916 Professor Charles Edward Bishop, of the University of West Virginia, gave a paper on Greek Comedy, and Professor Scribner brought The Message of Greek Vases.

That the pedagogical side of the programme has not been neglected in the past ten years the following list of subjects presented will prove: Vergil in the Secondary School; Ancient, particularly Greek and Roman, History; Prose Composition in School and College; Preparatory Classics; Some Ways to Vitalize High School Latin; Symposium: What should the High School Teacher know about the Classics?; How to improve present Conditions; Recent Achievements in Standardization of Secondary Latin Work; debate on Should all Students in Academic High Schools be required to study Latin?; The Direct Method as used by Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, and a practical Demonstration